

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

ORIGINAL
RECEIVED
NOV 20 1995

In the Matter of
Advanced Television Systems
and Their Impact upon the
Existing Television Broadcast
Service

Fourth Further Notice of Proposed
Rule Making and Third Notice
of Inquiry

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

MM Docket No. 87-268

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

COMMENTS OF JOHN KOMPAS and JACKIE BIEL, K-B LIMITED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

John Kompas and Jackie Biel, (hereinafter referred to as Kompas and Biel), owners of KB Limited, a Wisconsin corporation specializing in consulting, marketing, and information services for the LPTV industry, hereby submits their comments in the proposed rulemaking Fourth Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making and Third Notice of Inquiry ("NPRM"). Kompas and Biel seeks to comment on the adverse effects of the policies set forth in this NPRM on low power television, in the matter of Advanced Television Systems and their impact upon the existing television broadcast service.

Throughout of the notice of proposed rulemaking almost on every page the Commission has indicated their strong interest in local programming in community service. It is ironic that after this much interest in the topic of localism the Commission would completely ignore the mention of the fastest growing most localized broadcast service under its control.

When the question has come up about allowing LPTV stations a

C+4

preparatory access to advance TV frequencies the answers from the Commission seem to be that there are too many LPTVs that the engineering would be difficult or that the priority has not been high enough. But still the fact remains that community television stations, that portion of LPTV industry that is concentrating on local programming is being ignored in this Rule Making.

If numbers of stations are part of the problem we suggest that the Commission follow the lead of Congress in designating certain LPTVs as having an advance status over other LPTVs. Specifically, the Cable Act of 1992 when awarding must carry status to certain LPTV stations the Congress declared that those stations receiving the award are those that have agreed to operate under the rules of part 73 high power broadcasting. This group of approximately 400 stations are the ones that are specializing in local service to communities that have either been unserved or underserved in the scheme of high power television.

Though certification a LPTV operator how is following the rules and regulations of Part 73 and providing important local service should be separated from other LPTVs. In terms of engineering difficulties, under an analog system during the drafting of the Commission very first table of assignments, LPTV operators were able to show Commission the ability to include as many as three (3) LPTV stations within the nation's largest market New York City could be engineered into the scheme. Now that we know that advance television will operate in the digital format the job of engineering the stations into the scheme should become

significate easier since the inference criteria for separation of frequencies is significantly reduce.

If the reasons for not including certain LPTVs is a matter of priorities then we have confession over the intense Commission interest in providing local service.

POTENTIAL ADVERSE IMPACT OF THE COMMISSION'S ATV PROPOSAL ON THE COMMISSION'S LONG STANDING POLICY OF FOSTERING PROGRAMMING AND OWNERSHIP DIVERSITY.

Since the inception of the Communications Act of 1934, it has been the intent of the Federal Communications Commission (referred to "FCC" or "Commission") to establish broadcast station ownership patterns that represents the views of the public as these relate to the diverse communications industries and sub-industries. One of the basic underlying considerations of the 1934 Act was the desire to effectuate policy that discouraged the formation of monopolies in broadcast and effectuate ownership policies that would as a result diversify program content.¹

With this in mind, the Commission has set precedent with its adoption of various policies and programs which are intended to minimize whatever negative effect small entities might face in the advent of new rulemakings and new technologies.² For the purpose of this proposed rulemaking Fourth Further Notice of Proposed Rule

¹ See Section 307 of the Communications Act relating to the efficient distribution of the spectrum.

² See, for example, the small business protection adopted by Congress in the auction provisions of the Communications Act.

Making and Third Notice of Inquiry ("NPRM"), Kompas and Biel seeks to comment on the adverse effects of the policies set forth in this NPRM on low power television. These effects are a result of the Commission's decision to exclude low power television broadcasters from this important rulemaking and thus continue to maintain the LPTV's industry secondary status in television broadcasting.

Throughout the creation of the diversity policies for television broadcast service, the Commission adhered to the principle that diversification better serves the needs of the public at large. The Commission firmly stated that the vitality of the U.S. system of broadcasting depended largely on a diversified ownership and, hence, diversification of programming and service content.

The low power television³ medium is a niche broadcasting service with the potential to provide specialized programming to specialized markets, particularly underserved and ethnic communities. According to industry experts, approximately 42% of LPTV stations provide the public with programming for special demographic populations, reflecting fulfillment of the Commission's initial goal when establishing LPTV service in 1983. Moreover, LPTV stations on the air in the U.S. now number more than 1751 stations.⁴ The present LPTV figure comprises 1193 UHF and 558 VHF stations, compared to the nation's full power commercial and

³ Report and Order, March 4, 1982

⁴Part 74 CFR and Report and Order, 1982.

educational stations which now number approximately 1,542 stations.⁵

Despite the growth in ownership in the LPTV industry and the fact that LPTV broadcasters have made great efforts in the last decade to acquaint the various Commissioners with the unique and diverse services that LPTV provides to the public and record the successes that the LPTV industry has achieved with the Commission's stated goals of providing universal, over-the-air television service, the Commission's Fourth Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Third Notice of Inquiry has excluded low power broadcasters from any consideration in the transition plan and the proposed statement of proposed ATV policies.

Kompas and Biel is clear about the increased range of new service capabilities that digital technology will bring to television, as well as the capability to deliver multiple program streams over one 6 MHz channel that the conversion to digital will bring. But the Commission's reasons for these promised new services justify not including this segment of the television broadcasting industry in this ATV rulemaking. The Commission has stated that its initial reason for exclusion LPTV to be that the broader public interest would be best served by limiting initial channel allocation to existing eligible broadcasters, but are not over 800 licensed LPTV entrepreneurs broadcasters? Broadcasting is exclusively and exactly what we do.

In compliance with the Commission's principles of

⁵ See station totals in most recent Public Notice.

diversification of ownership, and universal service⁶ and the U.S. Constitution, any technical standards used to develop an allotment table should be readily and equally available to all broadcasters and the diverse audiences they serve, not just full power broadcasters. To exclude LPTV broadcasters from the ATV proceeding is to say that the Commission does not believe in its long stated standard that the public interest of all Americans would be served if all Americans could participate in the continued reception of television.

II. POTENTIAL IMPACT ON THE COMMISSION'S OBJECTIVE OF PROMOTING DIVERSITY OF VIEWPOINTS IN A DIGITAL WORLD.

The Commission should continue to value localism in an era of megamergers. LPTV is one of the few remaining services that focuses on local content. It is the local programming of that low power television broadcasters that bring services and programming to the underserved and ethnic communities throughout the U.S. Furthermore, part of the Commission's goals in inaugurating LPTV service were to bring local programming to communities that had never been served or had been underserved by full power television. Equally as important, was the desire to increase diversity in ownership in television broadcasting among women and minorities, since entrant of minorities in full power television is lower than that of LPTV due to the lack of access to capital by minorities. Currently there are 31 full power TV stations owned by minorities versus 124 LPTV stations owned by minorities.

⁶ See Sixth Report and Order (1952).

III. POTENTIAL IMPACT OF SPECTRUM RECOVERY AND CREATION OF CONTIGUOUS BLOCKS OF SPECTRUM ON LOW POWER TELEVISION BROADCASTERS.

With respect to the recovery of spectrum, in the Second Report/Further Notice, the Commission put broadcasters on notice that when ATV becomes the prevalent medium, broadcasters would be required to surrender a 6 MHz channel and cease broadcasting in NTSC.⁷ Later, in the Third Report/Further Notice, the Commission stated its plan to award broadcasters interim use of an additional 6 MHz channel to permit a smooth, efficient transition to an improved technology with as much certainty and as little inconvenience to the public and the industry as possible.

It is evident that the Commission remains committed to the recovery of spectrum to full power broadcasters, yet it not evident that the Commission remains committed to ownership rights of LPTV broadcasters with the advent of digital technology, with the possibility of eliminating a vast number of existing LPTV licensees. Furthermore, the Communications Act of 1934 mandates that the Commission allocates spectrum in a manner which is, among other things, efficient. 47 U.S.C. Section 307 (b). And as stated by Chairman Reed Hundt in his speech at the Pittsburgh Law School, the Commission ought to apply the public interest standard, with concrete duties imposed on broadcasters.

IV. POTENTIAL IMPACT OF THE EXCLUSION OF LPTV BROADCASTERS ON EFFECTS OF ATV TRANSITION TO SMALL MARKET BROADCASTERS

LPTV stations should not be displaced only when an alternative is not available. Adequate notice of any proposed allotment table

⁷ Second Report/Further Notice, 7 FCC Rcd 3340, 3353 (1992).

should be given, along with disclosure of all technical standards so LPTV broadcasters may recommend changes in individual allotments that will minimize any adverse impact upon them.

V. HOW THE COMMISSION CAN ACCOMMODATE LPTV BROADCAST STATIONS IN THE TRANSITION TO DIGITAL TELEVISION

LPTV stations should be given an opportunity to apply for remaining ATV spectrum after full power stations have applied for ATV spectrum, before the general public. Furthermore, any spectrum repackaging or recapture should consider perhaps establishing a guard band between full power TV and nonbroadcast services and therefore taking LPTV broadcasters into account.

Kompas and Biel supports the comments which oppose the Commission's exclusion of LPTV as primary licensees in the new ATV service. Kompas and Biel firmly believes that this action by the Commission is a violation of the Constitutional rights of the LPTV broadcasters.

Wherefore, for the foregoing reasons, STATION, respectfully submits that the Commission should revise its proposals in its Fourth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Third Notice of Inquiry to insure a more spectrally efficient ATV allotment table and to accommodate low power television broadcasters with an ATV simulcast channel. -

Respectfully submitted,

By: John Kompas

Dated: November 14, 1995

Jackie Biel

Owners of KB Limited
5235 North 124th Street
Suite 22
Butler, WI 53007